

1 N.E. 12. (Unamended) The apparatus of claim 11, wherein  
2 the remote printing device is one of a facsimile machine, a  
3 digital copier or a printer.

Please enter new claim 13 as follows:

A4 1 --13. The apparatus of claim 8, further comprising  
2 means, within the receiving station, for using the location  
3 indication as a variable when processing said each image.--

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7 and 9-10 are hereby amended and claim 13 is  
herein submitted for entry and examination. Therefore, claims 1-  
13 are currently pending in the present application.

5 In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the  
drawings, objected to the language of claim 7, and rejected  
claims 1-12 under either 35 USC §102 or §103 over Maurinus (U.S.  
Pat. No. 5,606,365), Krebs (U.S. Pat. 5,557,320), Slaughter, III,  
10 (U.S. Pat. 5,598,536), Dennsion (U.S. Pat. 5,546,445), Hoarty  
(U.S. Pat. 5,220,420) and/or Hassan (U.S. Pat. 5,550,646). Each  
of these points is addressed in turn below.

15 Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's  
suggestion that labels "10" and "12" refer to the same item. As  
disclosed in the specification at page 2, lines 17-18, "10"  
refers to image transfer system 10, which includes a remote  
station 12 coupled to a server station 14. The arrow in Fig. 1  
next to the label "10" points to the elements on Fig. 1 which  
collectively form an image transfer system 10. Therefore,  
withdrawal of the objection is requested.

20 As for the objection to claim 7, Applicant submits  
herewith an amended claim 7 complying with the Examiner's  
suggestion.

25 The rejection over the prior art is addressed in the  
following sections.

The Claimed Invention

Amended claim 1 is directed to a portable image transfer system which includes a digital still camera at a remote station, a receiving station, and a means for image processing, and a return link for sending commands from the receiving station to the remote station. In a specific embodiment of the invention described in the specification, a digital camera is located at a remote site coupled via a cellular telephone link to a receiving station having image processing capabilities. The receiving station receives images from the digital still camera and processes those images. If the means for image processing determines that additional images, modifications of received images, or other image data is needed, the receiving station sends commands to the remote station. The commands are either directions to a photographer requesting additional camera angles and the like, or directions to the camera or CPU for capturing additional image data where photographer intervention is not required.

As explained in the specification, this apparatus is extremely useful where, for example, detailed scientific imagery is being captured and processed in substantially real-time so that a determination can be made in substantially real-time as to whether or not sufficient image data has been captured. In a specific example described in the specification, stereoscopic images are captured at remote geologic formations, and the means for image analysis attempts to convert a stereoscopic image pair into a 3-dimensional model. If the means for image processing fails in this task, it sends a command to the remote station directing either the camera, the CPU or the photographer to obtain additional images so the photographer does not have to return to the scene to capture additional data, leaves the scene. One advantage to using such an apparatus is that a photographer or scientist at a remote location can be assured that the images needed to perform a particular inquiry are captured.

A

The Cited References:

Maurinus discloses an interactive digital still camera system wherein a digital still camera captures an image and the image is sent to a central computer for processing. The processed image is then transmitted back to the location of the digital still camera for display on a user's television set. One of the objectives of Maurinus is to provide an interactive system which has a simplified electronic still camera, with raw image data processing located remote from the simplified electronic still camera. Typically, the environment for use of such a device is in a user's home, where the digital camera is coupled to a home interface controller and a television.

Hoarty was cited for the proposition that it was known to use a modem in a video transmission system to provide user responses from the receiving stations. Hoarty discloses an interactive multimedia system with distributed processing such that users at home televisions can interact directly with video picture information because each user is provided with a home interface controller in which user response data packets are sent over telephone lines to a central computer and are used to affect the cable signal which is provided along a cable line to the user's home television set.

The Cited References Distinguished:

With reference to the rejection of claims 1-12 under either 35 USC §102 or §103 as being unpatentable over one or more of the cited references, applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection should be withdrawn because the claims, as amended, contain limitations not disclosed or suggested by any of the cited references, taken alone or in combination.

For example, claim 1 as amended recites a digital still camera at a remote station, a receiving station, a return link for sending commands from the receiving station to a remote station, and means, at the receiving station, for image

processing, where the commands are directions for obtaining further images as needed by the means for image processing. At least this element is not disclosed or suggested in any of the cited references. Maurinus does not disclose or suggest a return link for sending commands which are directions for obtaining further images. As can be seen in Fig. 2 of Maurinus, there is no return path to camera 10. While a bidirectional path is shown to home interface controller 54, such a bidirectional path cannot be used to send commands to camera 10 and Maurinus does not even suggest that commands might be displayed on television 60 instructing the user of camera 10 to move or adjust camera 10 to obtain further images. This is understandable, of course, since camera 10 is designed to be an inexpensive, mass consumer product which might be an interesting addition to a home entertainment center. As such, the arrangement of Maurinus would have no need for means for image processing at a receiving station and a return link for sending commands to the remote station requesting further images.

Hoarty also fails to disclose or suggest the claimed means for image processing or the claimed return link for sending commands which are directions for obtaining further images. Applicant notes that the Examiner has indicated, on page 8, second paragraph of the Office Action, that Hoarty discloses the use of modems to provide user responses from receiving stations. It appears from the disclosure of Hoarty that its receiving stations are located at the remote stations, therefore they have nothing to do with the claimed receiving stations, which are stations which receive image data and are co-located with the means for image processing.

Therefore, even assuming that Maurinus and Hoarty are properly combinable, the combination nonetheless fails to disclose or suggest each of the elements of claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 is allowable over those references. Upon cursory review of the other references of record not cited against claim 1, it

appears that each of those references also fail to disclose or suggest, alone or in combination, all the claimed elements of claim 1.

Dependent claims 2-13, which depend from allowable claim 1, are therefore also allowable.


CONCLUSION

The undersigned believes that this amendment is responsive to each of the objections and rejections made in the Office Action and that they have been overcome for the reasons set forth in the remarks. Reconsideration and allowance of all pending claims is earnestly solicited. If it is deemed that a telephone conversation would expedite the prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (415) 576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 170497

By

  
Philip H. Albert  
Reg. No. 35,819

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP  
Two Embarcadero Center, 8th Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94111-3834

Telephone: (415) 576-0200  
Fax: (415) 576-0300